

### **REMARKS**

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on September 16, 2009. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 126-129, 131-140, 142, and 144-154 were pending. By way of the present response, Applicant has: 1) amended claims 126, 132, and 137; 2) added no new claims; and 3) canceled no claims. Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the subject matter claimed and submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

### **Examiner Interview**

Applicant thanks Examiner Basehoar for the courtesy of conducting a telephone interview with Applicant and Applicant's representative on November 24, 2009 to discuss proposed amendments to the claims and the significance of the art cited in relation to the claims. Applicant provided the Examiner with an online presentation of the claimed invention and, subsequently, the parties discussed potential claim amendments to emphasize the differences between the art cited and the present claims. In particular, the Examiner recommended clarifying the input field-dependent GUI, assignment of specific actions, and the resulting generation of program code. No agreement as to patentability of the claims was made.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 126-129, 131-140, 142, 144-147, and 150-154 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strong et al., U.S. Patent 6,167,523 (hereinafter "Strong") in view of Hitchcock et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,376,891 (hereinafter "Hitchcock"). Applicant does not admit that Hitchcock is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind Hitchcock at a later date.

Strong describes a computer program for validating input data from an electronic form. In particular, Strong discusses the use of a CGI program, which is external to the form, to perform the validation of user data in a submission of the form and the configuration of such validation in the Registry of the server to which the form is submitted.

Hitchcock describes a forms engine that allows for data sharing between customizable online college admission forms. In particular, Hitchcock describes generating customized forms for each participating institution and converting the application information into a form compatible with the institution's internal database for delivery.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Strong and Hitchcock fails to disclose

- receiving, through a network, a form authored by a form authoring tool and containing one or more input fields;

- parsing, independently of the form authoring tool, the received form to identify the input fields contained in the received form;

- providing, independently of the form authoring tool, a graphical user interface to enable specification and configuration of one or more actions to be carried out in response to a subsequent specific submission of the form by a third party, wherein the graphical user interface allows for selection of actions from a group of two or more types of actions, includes the identified input fields, and allows for the configured actions to be dependent upon the data input during the specific submission of the form;

- automatically generating, independently of the form authoring tool, program code to carry out the one or more actions, wherein the program code is external to the form and independent of the form authoring tool;

- receiving the specific submission of the form from the third party; and

- executing the program code in response to receipt of the specific submission of the form from the third party to carry out the one or more actions.

(Amended claim 126).

For example, the combination of Strong and Hitchcock fails to disclose providing a GUI that includes input fields identified by parsing a received form. Strong describes validation of a form and configuring a registry with information used to perform said validation. In performing the validation, the invention in Strong receives data from a form (i.e., not the form itself) and, if a registry key identifier is included in the data, then the data can be validated. In describing the registry wizard

that configures the registry, Strong states that the program provides support for a ***“specific set of forms”*** and “automatically configures the registry keys and subkeys ***based on user responses to predetermined questions.***” (Strong, col. 8 lines 4-8) (emphasis added). Strong only describes the use of predetermined questions, not that the wizard receives and parses a form and then provides a GUI that includes identified input fields. Hitchcock describes data sharing between forms, but is silent regarding a GUI that includes identified input fields parsed from a received form.

The combination of Strong and Hitchcock also fails to disclose a GUI to enable specification and configuration of one or more actions to be carried out in response to a subsequent specific submission of the form by a third party, wherein the GUI allows for selection of actions from a group of two or more types of actions. Strong only describes a single type of action in any detail: performing validation, which may be configured via manipulation of a registry. Strong does vaguely refer to further “processing” that is performed by handlers and that the handlers can be invoked by registry subkeys. Strong’s description of the handlers is limited to how they are invoked. The handlers themselves are not described with any particularity and Strong does not disclose that the handlers may be configured in any way - e.g., while validation is described as including arguments, no similar function is described for the handlers. (see, e.g., Strong Fig. 5, and col. 3, lines 44-47, col. 7, lines 65-67, col. 8, and col. 10, line 58 - col. 11, line 14). Furthermore, Strong illustrates in Fig. 2 that the Wizard (272) is coupled to the Registry (270), but is not coupled to the Handlers (220). Similar to above, Hitchcock describes data sharing between forms, but is silent regarding a GUI to enable specification and configuration of one or more actions to be carried out in response to a subsequent specific submission of the form by a third party, wherein the GUI allows for selection of actions from a group of two or more types of actions.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 126 has been overcome.

While claims 132 and 137 differ from claim 126, they contain similar features to those discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the

rejection of claims 132-137 has been overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

Given that claims 127-129, 131, 133-136, 138-140, 142, 144-147, and 150-154 are dependent upon claims 126, 132, and 137, and include additional features, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 127-129, 131, 133-136, 138-140, 142, 144-147, and 150-154 has been overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 148-149 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strong, in view of Hitchcock, in further view of Whitmyer, U.S. Patent No. 5,895,468 (hereinafter "Whitmyer").

Whitmyer describes a device for automatically querying a docket, generating a response form based upon a retrieved client reminder, and emailing the response form to a client computer. The client may then choose a desired option and, the client computer generates a reply email based on the client's response.

Given that claims 148-149 are dependent upon claim 126, and include additional features, and given that Whitmyer does not remedy the shortcomings of Strong and Hitchcock described above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 148-149 has been overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and requests reconsideration of the present application.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Ryan W. Elliott at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: December 16, 2009

/Ryan W. Elliott/

Ryan W. Elliott

Reg. No.: 60,156

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
(408) 720-8300